

REMARKS


The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under section 102 (b) as being unpatentable over Naterman. The Examiner also rejects claim 1 as anticipated under section 102 (b) as being unpatentable over Bruhl.

Neither Naterman nor Bruhl show a shade that can be collapsed upon itself, into a smaller configuration, to facilitate its storage. In fact, neither Naterman nor Bruhl show a compressible member, made of a spring-like thin metal or plastic band, and which fits within a material portion, extending beyond the material portion along an arc, as set forth in the amended claim of this application.

Hence, it is submitted that claim 1 does not read upon either Naterman, nor Bruhl, nor can the specific structure as identified, in the claim, be found in Naterman or Bruhl, either directly, inferentially, nor is it rendered obvious.

The Examiner's further review of this application would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul M. Denk
Attorney for Applicant
Pat. Off. Reg. No. 22,598
763 South New Ballas Road, Ste. 170
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
(314) 872-8136

PMD/lms